



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Virgils Epische Technik. Von RICHARD HEINZE. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1903. 8vo, pp. viii, 487.

In consideration of the present tendency of philology in the direction of minute investigation of special phases of a subject, Professor Heinze's book with its largeness of scope and catholicity of treatment is a contribution, as unique as it is substantial, to our present knowledge of Virgil's masterpiece. There are many fields of philological endeavor in which works of this synthetic character might be expected as the logical sequence of a long series of elaborate dissertations; and it must be conceded that a great many of these dissertations find their sole reason for being in the assumption that they are parts, albeit small, of a mighty whole, which will be constructed in due time, when some master mind looms large upon a startled world. But curiously enough Heinze's book deals with a subject in which surprisingly little detailed work has been done. The technique of pre-Virgilian narrative, whether in prose or in poetry, has been but superficially examined, and the results are of the most meagre character. Of the writers who have dealt with Virgil some, like Plüss (*Vergil und die Epische Kunst*), Sabbadini (*il primitivo disegno dell' Eneide*), and Bethe (*Vergilstudien*, Rhein. Mus. XLVI, 511 ff.), have treated subjects similar to Heinze's, but it is only here and there that he shows indebtedness to them. The great majority of Virgil specialists have helped him only indirectly. The work is his own, and the bibliographical boggy justly plays a strictly subordinate rôle.

The book is an interpretation of the *Aeneid* from a technical point of view. Professor Heinze is concerned with the poem only in so far as it is a product of conscious art, and his aim is to make clear the principles of that art. While in his exposition he is sometimes compelled to touch upon such themes as Virgil's personality, his political views, and the general tendencies of his age, these questions are only incidental to his main subject. Matters of language and of verse-structure are passed over entirely.

Of the two parts into which the work is divided, the first (pp. 1-232) contains a technical analysis of the whole poem with the exception of the sixth book, which is omitted in order to prevent any duplication of Norden's work. The analysis, which follows the order of the events and not the order of the books, is carried through under the following heads: *Ilions Fall*, *Die Irr-*

fahrten des Aeneas, Dido, Wettspiele, and Aeneas in Latium. In each of these chapters Heinze describes the problem which confronted the poet, and reconstructs, so far as it is possible, the reasons which led him to the solution which he finally adopted. The second part of the book (pp. 235-480) is a highly elaborate recapitulation of the results of the detailed analysis, treated systematically in a series of chapters on *Die Methode des Schaffens*, *Erfindung*, *Darstellung*, *Komposition*, and *Ziele*.

Heinze's discussions of the different aspects of his subject abound in suggestive comments and far-reaching interpretation. Even theories that are not original with him gain new life from his spirited treatment. But in such abundance of material it is difficult for a reviewer to single out those points which will best serve to give an adequate idea of the book. The first chapter, for example, *Iliions Fall* (pp. 1-80), contains, besides introductory matter, technical analyses of Virgil's version of the story of the wooden horse, of his account of the sack of the city, and of the departure of the Trojan refugees. Of the substance of these only a brief summary can be given.

A notable passage is that in which Heinze points out how singularly well-adapted to Virgil's peculiar genius the subject was. The fall of Troy had been a favorite theme of poets and artists for centuries. It had been treated in early epic, in lyric, in classical drama, and in Hellenistic poetry. It had been painted or carved in countless works of art. It was known of all whom any poem of the Augustan age would reach, and it was for precisely this reason that Virgil was attracted to it. His literary ambitions, his best hopes of achievement did not lie along the lines of invention or originality, but of excellence in some such familiar field as this; and as a matter of fact there is no part of his work in which he attains a greater height of artistic merit than here.

The question at once arises, did Virgil include this in his work solely or mainly because it was a subject which attracted him, and in which he saw that he could do effective work? Or is it an essential part of his epic? Heinze does not leave us in doubt as to his opinion. He believes that its inclusion is not simply technically justifiable, but is even necessary to the unity of the poem. That it is technically justifiable will be conceded by all. The transfer of the Trojan Penates to a new site occupies an important place in the traditional versions of the story, and this in itself is enough to establish a connection between the city that had been and the city that was to be. The events of Troy's last night had accordingly a much stronger claim for a place in the Aeneid than they could ever have had for a place in the Odyssey. But Heinze overstates the case when he says that Virgil was obliged to include the story of the city's fall (p. 3, 'also musste die Iliupersis in das Gedicht aufgenommen werden') because it was on that occasion that Aeneas was charged with

the mission of transporting the Penates. We may reasonably ask the source of the obligation. Does Heinze mean that the poet was compelled by the unanimity or even by a preponderance of the traditional versions to make the last night of Troy the time of the imposition of this task upon Aeneas? So far as we know the versions of the story accessible to Virgil, this was not so. In reality, the only instructions bearing on the Penates which Aeneas receives in the second book are given to him by Hector's ghost (II, 293, *sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia Penates*), and this scene Heinze himself in another part of his book (p. 240) ascribes to Virgil's own invention.

Our author makes some especially suggestive remarks in explaining Virgil's technique in putting the story into the mouth of Aeneas. He begins by pointing out that we have here something much more than a mere imitation of the narrative of Odysseus. The two cases are indeed very different. The adventures narrated by Odysseus were for the most part his own, and so could be described by him without much danger of violating the unities of time and place. But Virgil undertook the task of crowding into the experience of one man events which on any reasonable interpretation of the authorities must have taken place in many different parts of the city. He did this, as Heinze shows us, for the sake of the effectiveness that would come from concentration. Nor is there any doubt but that he has in the main attained his end. The interest in the narrative is sharply focused. That in a few passages he has failed to overcome entirely the difficulties of the situation and has made Aeneas recount as an eye-witness things which he could only have heard of later, does not detract appreciably from the general success of the method.

The most serious difficulty which Virgil had to meet in the composition of the second book was the fact that he was compelled to show us the Trojans in defeat, and the Trojans are not only the heroes of his narrative, but also the ancestors of the Romans and in a sense identified with them. More than that, he had to describe their desertion of their city and the moving of the city's gods. How tender a question this was with the Romans we know from more than one passage in Latin literature. It comes out clearly, for example, in the famous speech of Camillus, Liv. V, 41 ff. Virgil fully realized the delicacy of his task. Yet he could not to any great extent simplify the problem by introducing new material, for the main lines of the story were too well-known. His only plan was to order his narrative in such a way that there would be no sign of weakness or cowardice on the part of the Trojans, and that their action in abandoning the ancient site would be fully justified. Heinze's analysis shows how skilfully Virgil has done this. There were, it will be remembered, besides the *ex post facto* prophecy in the Iliad a number of versions of the circumstances of Aeneas's

survival. The oldest of these, which was adopted by Sophocles in his *Laocoon*, represented Aeneas as withdrawing from the city before the final catastrophe; but this was rejected by Virgil because it did not show the Trojan in a sufficiently heroic light. The later form of the story, according to which Aeneas saved father and gods from the conquered city through the assistance of Venus, had certain features which suited Virgil's purpose, but he could not adopt it because the supernatural element would have tended to depress Aeneas's individual heroism. There were also, from Virgil's point of view, serious objections to the version mentioned by Livy, I, 1. In this account Aeneas fell into the hands of the Greeks, but was spared by them because there was *hospitium* between him and Odysseus, and he had moreover made an effort to induce the Trojans to restore Helen. But Virgil could not represent his hero as accepting favors from the Greeks. In the version of Timaeus it was only the prominent place given to Aeneas's *pietas* that was adapted to the poet's plan. Between the story of Hellanicus and that of Virgil there are more points of contact, but, just as we should expect, that part of the account of Hellanicus which dwells upon the defeat of the Trojans in the city is not incorporated in the *Aeneid*. Virgil's method, therefore, of dealing with his sources was one of selection, of modification, even of manipulation. He had at all costs to save his hero's face. The same purpose influenced to some extent the character of the new material, small as it was in amount, which he introduced. The ghost of Hector warns Aeneas that the destruction of the city has been decreed by fate. In making the apparition speak with such emphasis about the will of the fates, Virgil is endeavoring to make it clear that no human power could have saved the city, and that Aeneas in abandoning it was yielding not to the Greeks but to the insuperable might of the gods. The implication is that only the bravest of the brave would have fought as Aeneas did. For in spite of the fact that it had been revealed to him that the city was doomed, he did not leave it till the spread of the conflagration proved the truth of Hector's words. In keeping with this is the stress laid by the poet on the extent of the *incendium* even early in the night (cf. vv. 310, 327, 329, 353, 374, etc.), which has no other purpose than to show how hopeless further resistance on the part of Aeneas would have been, and to justify his flight. It is noticeable that in the versions given by most of Virgil's predecessors the Greeks did not set fire to the city until just before their departure. In the matter of the transportation of the gods, Virgil reduces the repulsive element by making the point that they had originally been established in Italy, and so they were not emigrating, but returning to their former home.

In his second chapter, *Die Irrfahrten des Aeneas* (pp. 81-112), Heinze subscribes to the general opinion that the third book is far inferior to the second. He does not, however, think that its

inferiority is due to the fact that in it Virgil had to deal with a loosely connected series of adventures, while in the second his subject was a single catastrophe. The poetical possibilities of adventures of voyage have been too clearly established by the *Odyssey* to admit this argument. Indeed it is altogether likely that the similarity of this part of Virgil's poem to the *Odyssey* has had a great deal to do with its indifferent success. It has suffered by comparison. Moreover, Virgil himself, although he has frequently dared to measure himself with Homer, in this case does not seem to have brought his usual spirit to the task. It will be remembered that this book was one of the last to be written. Furthermore, in his account of the fall of Troy he had before him the works of more than one poet; but of Aeneas's wanderings there was a lamentable dearth of poetical versions.

Material there was of course in abundance. There were many legends of settlements made and temples founded by Aeneas after his flight from Troy. Virgil did not have to invent adventures for his hero. His task was to give to the adventures which tradition assigned to his hero, or to a selected series of those adventures, a consistent motive and a reasonable degree of unity. The motive which he finally hit upon was the gradual revelation to Aeneas of the end of his wanderings: the Trojan leaves his native land on the strength of auguries which bid him seek a new home in a foreign country; this general intimation becomes more definite at Delos with the oracle's reference to the *antiqua mater*; in Crete he learns from the Penates that it is Italy that is meant; at the Strophades Celaeno prophesies the eating of the tables; in Buthrotum Helenus mentions the west coast of Italy, and reveals the import of the prodigy of the sow; it is he too who bids Aeneas consult the Sibyl at Cumae. So through successive stages Aeneas fares towards the fulfilment of his destiny.

The third chapter (pp. 113-139) discusses the Dido episode from various points of view. That Virgil should have said something about his hero's love-affairs was, Heinze thinks, only to be expected in consideration of the parts played by Calypso and Circe in the story of *Odysseus*. Yet in his treatment of the subject Virgil has not followed Homer. He has indeed departed more widely from early Greek epic here than in any other part of his poem. The detailed description of romantic love found no place in Homer. Enamoured divinities regret *Odysseus's* departure, but we do not find them portrayed as overwhelmed with grief. There is no especial poignancy of feeling indicated: Calypso shows a praiseworthy interest in *Odysseus's* commissariat; Circe very considerably tells him how he can best direct his course. In neither case do we hear anything of parting words. In Hellenistic poetry, however, the case was very different. Apollonius's portrayal of the passion of Medea has many features that are strikingly modern, and it was by such examples as this that Virgil was influenced. The presence of Hellenistic

influence here is significant of his attitude towards his literary predecessors. Speaking generally, he modelled his epic on that of Homer, but where later periods had developed new interests he was quick to take advantage of them and to incorporate them in his work. Yet not without discrimination. He was, for example, careful in the last interview between Dido and Aeneas to refrain from that excessive elaboration of detail which he recognized as belonging to epyllion rather than to epic. Otherwise epic dignity would have been quickly submerged in a somewhat gruesome sentimentality. There are other features also in which Virgil's method differs essentially from that of the Hellenistic erotic poets. With the latter love at first sight, without preamble or preparation, is the usual thing. A case in point is the love of Medea for Jason in Apollonius. But Virgil's procedure is much more methodical. We hear of no flaming up of passion on the occasion of the first meeting of Aeneas and Dido. Moreover, as if extremely sceptical of the possibilities of such incendiary emotion, Virgil shows the greatest care in leading up to their meeting, and provides with the utmost deliberation for a favorable impression. The different stages are noticeable: on Aeneas's side his mother's account of Dido, his own view of the new city and of the queen discharging her official duties; on Dido's side the description which Teucer had given her of Aeneas's part in the war (I, 619 ff.), and the words of his own followers who had reached her court before him. Heinze suggests that Virgil may have adopted these deliberate preliminaries on account of the mature age of his hero and heroine, but a more likely explanation is that the poet was influenced by Roman ideas. Another point of difference between Virgil and the erotic poets of Alexandria may be noticed. In the latter the main stress is generally laid upon physical beauty; but Virgil, while he does not neglect this side (Cp. I, 588 ff.), gives considerable prominence to other reasons for the interest which Dido and Aeneas felt in each other: admiration for their respective achievements, sympathy with one another's trials, and the similarity of their fortunes.

The scenes in which Anna is introduced have a high technical importance. Anna's part, it should be pointed out, is very different from that of Chalciope in Apollonius's *Argonautica*, with which it has frequently been compared. Apollonius, adhering in this respect to traditional epic standards, did not make Chalciope Medea's confidante. He was apparently afraid of encroaching on the domain of drama. But Virgil boldly made Anna the confidante of Dido, and through her introduced a large dramatic element into his poem. The gain was very great. By means of this dramatic device many scenes have a vividness that they could not otherwise have attained to. It is in conversation with Anna that Dido's deepest feelings are revealed. Direct analysis or description of her emotions would have been much less effec-

tive, and a series of monologues could not have failed to be monotonous. As it is, Virgil resorts to the monologue only in pathetic crises.

In the chapter on Wettspiele (pp. 144-166) there is an instructive comparison between the games celebrated by the Trojans on the anniversary of the death of Anchises and the funeral games in honor of Patroclus in the Iliad. The former are so manifestly an imitation of the latter that we have an excellent opportunity of examining Virgil's methods in imitation. The comparison shows us that his treatment differs from Homer's in several respects, in some of which the balance of artistic merit is clearly on Virgil's side. In the first place Virgil has reduced the risk of monotony by cutting down the number of events. He has, moreover, shown a greater regard for proportion than Homer, and has succeeded in introducing more variety into the ordering of the contests. In Homer each contest begins in pretty much the same way. A statement is made regarding its nature, the prizes are enumerated, then *στῆ δ' ὀρθὸς καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείουσιν ἔειπεν*, and after the speech *ὣς ἔφατ'*, *ἄρτο δ' ἔπειτα*, *οἱ ὄρνυτο δ' αὐτίκα*, and the names of the contestants. This is repeated again and again with but slight variation. In Virgil on the contrary the preliminaries of each event are carefully differentiated. Homer's description gives the impression of eight separate events; Virgil is more successful in giving unity to the games, and he rounds off the whole with the *Troiae ludus*. In Homer the first event takes more lines than all the others together. The latter, moreover, show a fairly steady decrease in length, almost every one being shorter than its predecessor. In Virgil the first is also the longest, but the third is almost as long, while the second and the fourth are about half the length of the others. So we have long and short pieces alternating, and this arrangement tends to give the effect of a unified whole instead of a merely chronological series. Nor is there any diminution of interest towards the end, as in the Homeric account, where the last event is despatched in 14 lines as opposed to 389 assigned to the first.

That Homer's games are still the more interesting, and Heinze hardly disputes this, is very largely due to the characters of the contestants. In Virgil those who take part are, as compared with the brilliant figures of Homer's pages, almost unknown. The mere names of Homer's heroes are material to conjure with, and would save the piece even if there were still greater disregard for proportion and other proprieties of structure. Virgil's attempt to connect some of his contestants with famous Roman families does not go very far towards relieving their obscurity.

The fifth chapter, entitled Aeneas in Latium (pp. 167-232), deals with what Virgil himself called his *maius opus*, i. e., his account of the events between the landing of the Trojans and the death of Turnus. The material presented by these six books is so manifold, the points of view so various that Heinze's compact

and orderly treatment again commands our admiration. He begins with a summary of different versions of the Trojan settlement in Latium, touching on those of Cato, Dionysius, and Livy. We see that Virgil, as usual, did not draw exclusively from any one source. He follows Cato in representing the Latins and Rutulians in league against the Trojans, but differs from him in describing Latinus as at variance with his own people and opposed to the war. He adopts the story found both in Cato and in Dionysius which makes the Etruscan Mezentius one of the chief opponents of Aeneas, but in enlisting the main force of the Etruscans on the side of the Trojans he has, in part at least, adopted a version of which we find traces in Timaeus. The reenforcement of the Trojans by Evander and his Arcadians is apparently an invention of Virgil's.

For some of these alliances the poet's reasons are manifest. The league with the Arcadians accomplishes two things. First, it enables Virgil to introduce the episode of Aeneas's visit to the future site of Rome, and so to touch upon many matters of immediate interest to his countrymen. In the second place, Aeneas's absence from the camp gives the poet an opportunity of portraying the prowess of Turnus. Had Aeneas been on the ground Turnus could not have performed such deeds of valor as the ninth book contains without seriously detracting from the Trojan hero's laurels. That Virgil should have adopted the tradition of an alliance between the Trojans and the Etruscans can be readily understood. Without some such reenforcement Aeneas's success in combating the numerous forces arrayed against him would hardly have been possible. In some other respects, however, Virgil's manipulation of his sources does not seem justifiable. Objection may reasonably be taken to his placing the Etruscan prince Mezentius on one side and the Etruscan army upon the other; and his treatment of Latinus is still more open to criticism. Heinze attempts an explanation of the latter case. He suggests that Virgil did not wish to portray Aeneas in the doubtful rôle of abductor. The abduction of women had already brought tribulation enough upon the heads of offending Trojans. So the sympathetic attitude of Latinus and his opposition to the war-policy of his people were intended to justify Aeneas in his somewhat heroic wooing of Lavinia, to save, forsooth, his *pietas*! But this explanation cannot be accepted. Aeneas's *pietas* had survived ruder shocks than this. The part assigned to Latinus must be regarded as one of the least felicitous devices in the poem.

A comparison of Virgil's chronology with that of the traditional versions reveals some interesting points. Passing over the familiar fact of his having compressed the events of a considerable period of time into a few days, we find a conspicuous example of his love for concentration in the manner in which he has arrayed the Latins, Turnus, and Mezentius against Aeneas all at the same time. In the traditional accounts Aeneas meets

these different forces at different times. As an example of effective concentration this simultaneous muster vies with the method of treatment adopted in the second book, and the impressiveness of the *moles belli* is beyond all question. Equally justifiable on artistic grounds is the departure from the traditional chronology in the death of Turnus. In Virgil's sources this took place before the death of Mezentius, but Virgil realized the necessity of making a change. Turnus was the great rival of Aeneas, and it was natural that the defeat of less formidable opponents should be treated as but preliminary to the final conflict between him and Aeneas. That Virgil ends the poem at this point and adds nothing about the founding of the city is one of the many dramatic devices introduced into the Aeneid. The outcome of the final duel shows all our hero's difficulties overcome, all obstacles removed. The rest is left to our imagination.

In his description of the battles (books ix-xii) Virgil once more comes into close comparison with Homer, and we have another good example of independence within imitation. In Turnus's feats of arms in the ninth book there are many reminiscences of Hector's deeds; in the siege of the Trojan fortress the influence of the Teichomachia is clearly apparent; and the source of the catalogue of the Etruscan ships is so obvious as hardly to require mention. But Virgil's narrative shows also many points of difference: e. g. the introduction of cavalry, the absence of those long enumerations of slaughter which occur in the Iliad, as, for instance, at the beginning of the sixth book, the avoidance of anatomical analyses of wounds, and finally less frequent repetition and a more orderly arrangement of the whole. Yet it must not be supposed that Virgil introduced these features into his poem simply to break the continuity of a too persistent imitation. That was not his attitude towards imitation. The changes were made for different reasons. Some of them were based on artistic grounds. Virgil felt, for example, that the anatomical details of a wound, however picturesque they might be, hardly belonged to the province of epic art; and that the numerous repetitions in the Homeric poems had no place in the more developed epic of his own age. Other points of difference in the Virgilian treatment constitute appeals to national interests. A good example is the use of cavalry. This touched the military life of his contemporaries, and here he could be sure of a response. The use of such expressions as *signa sequi*, *vexillum*, etc., is dictated by the same feeling. The greater orderliness of his battle-scenes is doubtless due, as Heinze suggests, to reaction from the confusion which is noticeable in many of the Homeric battles. But Heinze has not observed that although Virgil's descriptions, as a result of his careful treatment, are less complicated, show fewer sudden shifts and turns, and are in all their details more easily kept before the mind, Homer's are more like battles.

The first chapter of the second part of the book contains a general account of Virgil's treatment of his sources, an analysis of his attitude toward his literary predecessors, a discussion of the original element in the *Aeneid*, and a description of the poet's manner of working. Matters of this kind have already been taken up in connection with different parts of the poem. They are now discussed with reference to the whole work. The general trend of Heinze's conclusions on the first three of these questions has already been sufficiently indicated in earlier parts of this review. We have seen that Virgil selected or combined traditional versions of legends only after a most careful consideration of the various aspects of the specific problem before him. It has been pointed out, moreover, that although he made a very large use of the works of poets who had preceded him in the same or in similar fields, yet the amount of independent work, even in passages where the general plan has been borrowed from another, is much greater than is as a rule recognized. The brevity of the section on *das Eigene* (pp. 251-254) is due to the fact that Virgil's originality is to be found in method rather than in matter.

That subdivision of the chapter which deals with *Arbeitsweise* is based on Suetonius's well-known statement, *Aeneida . . . particulatim componere instituit prout liberet quidque et nihil in ordinem arripiens*. Heinze's treatment is interesting, but does not present very much that is new. His conclusions are substantially those of Conrads (*Quaest. Verg.* p. xviii). Accepting the theory that the order of the books is not the order of composition, he points out that Virgil even in touching on subjects to which in the nature of things he would have to return, was more influenced by the immediate requirements of his context than by regard for the interests of the poem as a whole. Moreover, the revision by which the poet intended to remove the inconsistencies that were an inevitable result of his manner of working was never completed. All this is familiar and will not be disputed. The same may be said of Heinze's remark that the poem was intended to be read aloud in parts, rather than to be perused in its entirety, and that each part accordingly had to have a certain degree of completeness. In developing his theme, however, Heinze goes farther than seems warranted by the facts. He has been speaking of the custom of recitation, and then, describing an epic poem, adds '*das Werk muss die Eigenschaften eines zusammenhängenden langen Gedichts homerischer Art und eines Kranzes von Einzelgedichten Kallimacheischer Art in sich vereinigen*'. That this passage contains a reasonably accurate description of the *Aeneid* is apparent; and that this kind of epic is very largely due to the custom of recitation is equally clear. But whether Virgil was justified in departing from traditional standards of epic poetry in order to conform to the literary fashions of his day is a different question.

Heinze assumes rather than demonstrates that such conformity on Virgil's part was a matter of necessity.

One section of the chapter on *Erfindung* is given up to a discussion of Virgil's characterization. It is pointed out that the poet's work in this respect is for the most part in keeping with the Hellenistic tendency to portray types rather than individuals. In the delineation of a majority of the characters the lines of differentiation coincide with differences of age, sex, or nationality. In Ascanius we have the type of the young noble. Euryalus, Lausus and Pallas are types of young men. Ilioneus, Nautes (V, 704), Evander, and Anchises are typical old men. Certain general characteristics are obvious also in the case of the women. Their most noticeable quality is their excitability, which is of a peculiarly passionate kind, and frequently passes into frenzy. The Trojan women in the fifth book, Dido, and Amata are good examples, in an ascending scale, of the different stages of its manifestation. It should, however, be added that the delineation of the characters of the more prominent women shows something besides general characteristics of the sex. Dido, for example, represents Virgil's ideal of the heroic type of woman (p. 134). Of national types we have but meagre characterizations, setting forth with more or less faintness of outline the conventional attitude of the Romans towards foreign peoples: Sinon is the shifty, lying Greek; the phrase *Tyrii bilingues* reproduces Roman prejudice towards the Carthaginians; while the description of the pleasure-loving Etruscans given by Tarchon in his speech (XI, 736) corresponds to current Roman ideas.

A special section is devoted to an analysis of the character of Aeneas. This is one of the least satisfactory parts of the book. In Aeneas Heinze sees 'den Typus des Römers wie er dem Römer selbst sich darstellt—wohlgemerkt dem Römer augusteischer Zeit und stoischer Observanz'. He is, to be sure, alive to the fact that there are many incidents in Aeneas's career which are not consistent with this theory: e. g., his lack of coolness and steadiness on the night of Troy's fall, his continual complaints about the hardness of his lot, the oblivion of his high destiny shown in his stay at Carthage, his pusillanimity on the occasion of the burning of the ships in Sicily. But Heinze's explanation is that Virgil does not intend to represent Aeneas as the ideal type of Roman from the beginning, but rather as in the process of making. That Aeneas is shown to us in moments of weakness in the first part of the poem is, according to this theory, for the specific purpose of contrast with the strength he evinces in the later stages of his career. He is a man whose spiritual growth is through affliction. He is stronger from the time of his interview with the Sibyl, which is supposed to mark a crisis in his development. The stoical element in his character Heinze illustrates by a number of parallel passages quoted from Seneca.

This interpretation of Aeneas's character will commend itself to very few. To suppose that the many incidents in which

Aeneas manifestly falls short of any reasonable conception of Roman ideals are only so many stumbles in a long course of moral advancement is inconsistent with what we know of Virgil's method of working. Heinze's own exposition of that method makes so systematic a portrayal of the hero's character extremely improbable. We have already seen that Virgil was more interested in the particular book that he was writing than he was in the consistency of the books or in the due subordination of each one to the whole poem. That we see different aspects of Aeneas in different parts of the work is due to the fact that Virgil was prone to emphasize those qualities which were best adapted to the immediate purpose of the scene which he was describing.

Pages 348-389 contain an analysis of Virgil's method in narration. Among other things we see that he regarded the deeds of individuals as much better material for his narrative than the actions of masses. Even where he is obliged by the circumstances of the case to say something about the concerted or simultaneous action of a group, he passes with all possible speed to the individuals. For example, in the first part of his account of the funeral services of Misenus (VI, 212 ff.) he speaks of the Trojans generally, but the crowd is soon broken up into smaller parties: *pars calidos latices . . . expediunt . . . pars ingenti subiere feretro*; and finally we come to individuals: *ossa cado texit Corynaeus . . . at pius Aeneas*, and so forth. We find precisely the same thing in the description of the landing in Italy (VI, 5). And in battle-scenes the same method is adopted. In telling of the attack on the Trojan fortress in IX, 25 ff. Virgil gives only two lines to matters of a general nature, then at once directs attention to prominent individuals in the attacking party. The account of the Trojan defense is similar: an introduction of one or two lines is followed immediately by the speech of Caicus. With this may be compared the situation of the beleaguered Trojans in X, 120 ff. The explanation of Virgil's method is not hard to find. Ever watchful of the interest of his audience, he saw clearly that this could be held much more effectually if it were centered in individuals than if it were dissipated among miscellaneous groups. To this method of Virgil's there is one striking exception: his treatment of the cavalry in XI, 597-635 and 868 ff. Heinze's explanation, that in the compact squadrons of horsemen we have so many units, seems wide of the mark. It is more probable that Virgil departed from his usual custom in this particular case because he realized that the thunder of cavalry was effective enough to be substituted for any individual prowess.

One feature of Virgil's narrative which deserves especial attention is its compression. He fully realized the necessity of cutting down his material. He saw that if he were to describe Aeneas's adventures in strict chronological order, monotony would be inevitable. So, following the example of Homer in

the *Odyssey*, he began his poem at a time when Aeneas's long probation was already drawing to an end, and let the hero himself tell the story of the previous years. This made the compression of the material that belonged to those years comparatively easy. For it was only natural that Aeneas, telling the story as he did, should single out only those adventures that marked epochs in his career.

Still another characteristic of Virgil's narrative style is its sympathetic quality: 'Virgil hat sich in die Seele der Handelnden versetzt und erzählt aus ihr heraus'. More than this, he has inspired the same sympathy in his readers, not by direct appeal to them but by subtle suggestion. In the series of passages quoted by Heinze the effect is largely due to single words (often epithets) and phrases charged with a tempered emotionalism. These produce the impression of depth of feeling, but of feeling under strict control. It was consistent with this sympathetic attitude that Virgil should have phrased some of his descriptions of nature with special reference to the matter in hand. For while most readers will agree with Heinze that the remarks attributed by Servius, XI, 183, to Asinius Pollio are too comprehensive, it cannot be doubted that there is an intentional correspondence between certain descriptions of dawn, for example, and the situation of the heroes of the poem. Perhaps the most remarkable thing in connection with this sympathetic quality in Virgil is that it is in no way dependent upon subjectivity.

Of the remaining chapters of Heinze's book the most important is that on *Komposition*, but as this has already been touched upon, further reference may be omitted.

In conclusion it is not too much to say that no one for many years has deserved so well of Virgil as Heinze. Special investigations that have gone deeper we have had; but there has been no work that combines so successfully comprehensiveness of scope and skilful handling of material. Heinze has, moreover, without at any time taking a brief for his author, proved clearly and concretely the fallacy of that view which would see in Virgil nothing but a rather superior imitator. While readily accepting the fact of Virgil's great indebtedness to Homer, he definitely establishes '*Selbständigkeit in der Imitation*'. That there are some conclusions that will not be accepted, even some deficiencies in the book, is undoubtedly true. It is, for example, to be regretted that it contains so little about the influence of the rhetorical schools upon Virgil's style. But in spite of such shortcomings no student, and especially no teacher of Virgil, can read it without being profoundly influenced by it.